

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request that the above application be reconsidered, as amended.

Claims 1-13 are currently pending. Claims 1-7 have been allowed, and Claims 12 and 13 are said to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 8-11 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b). Claims 14-32 have been withdrawn by the Examiner from further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim 8 has been amended to specify that the protective coating comprises at least about 40% by weight of the named platinum group metal or metals, as described in line 7 of paragraph [0031] of the specification.

No new matter is introduced by the above amendment, and it is requested that it be entered.

A. Response to Rejection of Claims 8-11 under 35 USC 102(b) as Anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,455,167 B1 (Rigney et al.)

Claims 8-11 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,455,167 B1 (Rigney et al.). The '167 reference is said to disclose a coating for a turbine engine component comprising a first layer of alumina, a second metal layer that may include Pt, and a third ceramic layer. Regarding Claim 9, it is said that the first layer is alumina. Regarding Claims 10 and 11, it is said that the alumina layer may be less than 1 to about 10 microns. Col. 6, lines 10-15 of the '167 reference has been cited as disclosing: "MCrAlX bond coats include compositions in which M is an element selected from the group consisting of Fe, Co and Ni and combinations thereof, while X is an element consisting of Ti, Ta, Re, Si, B, C, Y, Hf, Zr and Pt, and combinations thereof."

In response thereto, Claim 8 has been amended to specify that the protective coating comprises at least about 40% by weight of the named platinum group metal or metals. The cited '167 reference does not disclose or suggest that Pt, which is one possible element X in the MCrAlX bond coat, represent at least about 40% by weight of the coating as now required in Applicants' Claim 8. This is apparently recognized by the Examiner since Applicants' Claim 12 requiring that the protective coating comprise at least about 50% by weight of platinum or rhodium, or mixtures thereof, was not rejected over the '167 reference.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Claims 8-11 are not anticipated by or rendered obvious over the '167 reference. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

B. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-7 have been allowed.

It is also stated that Claims 12 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, in view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claims 8-11 has been overcome, and that the objection regarding dependent Claims 12 and 13 should also be withdrawn.

C. Conclusion

It is believed that the above represents a complete response to the Examiner's rejections and places the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of Claims 8-13 are respectfully requested.

Applicants would appreciate the courtesy of a telephone call should the Examiner have any questions or comments with respect to this response.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Donald E. Hasse
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,387
(513) 229-0383
Customer Number 31838

February / , 2005